UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,069	11/27/2000	Ari Becks	BP100710	7165

466	7590	07/29/2005

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET
2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER
PIERRE, MYRIAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
09/701,069</td><td>Applicant(s)
BECKS ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Myriam Pierre</td><td>Art Unit
2654</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09/10/2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4-6 and 8-16_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-2, 4-6, 8-16_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _27 November 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Applicant's Amendment filed 12/10/2004, responding to the OA of 09/10/2004.

Applicant's amended specification, amended claims 1, 9-10; canceled claims 3 and 7;

and added new claim 16.

Response to Arguments

2.   The applicant's arguments have been fully considered and the applicant's

arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons:

>   Applicant argues that Franz does not teach one of said rules (first language rule)
>
>   is updated (stored) on the basis of equivalent segment (translation or match)
>
>   input by the user from the user interface (apparatus that displays text). However,
>
>   Franz does teach storing, which imply updating, an artisan with ordinary skill in
>
>   the art would realize that it would imply updating, and updating implies that that
>
>   the rules are processed in real time, or after the user inputs the information
>
>   (stores translation example data made up of examples in clause units expressed
>
>   in the first language (first rule) and corresponding second language page 7 line
>
>   10-13; apparatus that displays text, apparatus that displays text).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

>   A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Franz et al. (EP 805403 A2).

As to claims 1 and 10, Franz teaches

a method for machine translation of information given a character string in a first

language into a character string in a second language, comprising the steps of:

storing, in a knowledge database, a first language character string model segments

(store first language sentence clause, page 7 line 10-13; sentence clause

inherently includes string model segments), and storing second language model

segments (example stored, which includes clause units) in logical connection

(corresponding) with the first language character strings (clause units) (stores

translation example data made up of examples in clause units expressed in the

first language and corresponding second language, page 7 lines 14-17; clause

units inherently include model character strings), the second language model

segments inherently being second language character strings.

Identifying a structural segment in the character string of said first language following a

first rule (Sentence structure is structural segment of a sentence, character

words (or strings) of first language, uses first rule (dividing/division pattern) 1st

language divided into syntax units or sentence structure, page 2, line 23, page 5,

lines 22-26, and page 7, lines 4-7 and 11);

comparing identified structural segment with model segments in the form of character

strings in the first language stored according to a second rule (Sentence

structural is structural segment, model segment are examples that are stored in

memory of translations, character strings or character words, second rule

(detecting collation of 1st language to examples that are stored as phrase units),

page 5, lines 27-32, page 8, lines 54 and 56, and page 9 lines 43 and 46);

striving to select one model segment on the basis of said comparison (Model segments

are examples stored in memory, "translating means" chooses/selects the best

example or model segment that best fits 1st language, page 5, lines 27-32);

reading a model in the form of a character string in the second language logically

connected to the selected model segment (Example or model, recognizes/reads

character words in second language to connect best matched examples, or

model segment, page 5, lines 31-32);

translating structural segment into translation segment in the form of a

character string in the second language on the basis of said equivalent

segment and a third rule (Translating means translates sentence structure, or

structural segment, into translation segment, or syntax units, from character

words (strings) in second language, and third rule or clause pattern syntax,

calculations to find 'example' corresponding to the 1st language matches 2nd

language, page 5, lines 38-42, and page 9, lines 16 and 18);

identification of an intermediate word and/or a suffix and said first rule is essentially

based on the identification of intermediate word and/or suffix (Syntax analyzing

processing part are parts of speech that uses morpheme information –suffix or

parts of words- and first rule (dividing), page 7, lines 51-52 and page 5, lines 22-26).

following a first rule, identifying a first structural segment in a first language character string (Fig. 5, converting part, element 6, simple syntax analyzing part identifies, on the basis of morpheme information, page 7 lines 18-22);

following a second rule, comparing the first structural segment with the stored first language character string model segments (inputting part, detects word, first language sentence, part of speech and morpheme analysis, page 6 lines 36-39; the inputting part follows a rule of comparing the language structure, which is part of the example stored, segmenting the first language into model segments (example stored), such as part of speech and morpheme analysis);

selecting (the selecting part necessarily includes reading, as a translation segment, a stored second language model segment previously been logically connected to the selected one first language character string model segment) one stored first language character string model segment (first language sentence) that has previously been logically connected (matching any of the examples stored) to the selected one first language character string model segment (clause division pattern)(clause dividing part determines whether or not there is in the first language sentence clause matching any of the examples stored in a clause division pattern translation example memory, page 6 lines 58-59 and page 7 lines 1-3; first language sentence is an example stored);

selecting (the selecting part necessarily includes reading, as a translation segment, a

stored second language model segment previously been logically connected to

the selected one first language character string model segment) one stored first

language character string model segment (first language sentence) that has

previously been logically connected (matching any of the examples stored) to the

selected one first language character string model segment (clause division

pattern)(clause dividing part determines whether or not there is in the first

language sentence clause matching any of the examples stored in a clause

division pattern translation example memory, page 6 lines 58-59 and page 7 lines

1-3; first language sentence is an example stored);

following a third rule, translating the first structural segment into said translation

segment, the translation segment inherently being in the form of a character

string in the second language (reads from the clause division pattern translation

example memory, element 5, the translation corresponding to the example

matching the clause used to divide up the first language sentence, page 7 lines

6-9; thus, the clause division pattern translates first structural segment, which is

the based on the clause dividing part, element 4.);

the first rule comprises the identification of at least one of an intermediate word and a

suffix (morpheme information, page 7 lines 18-20; the identification of the

structure, the first rule, includes obtaining morpheme information),

the method comprises the identification of an intermediate word and/or a suffix and said

first rule is essentially based on the identification of intermediate word and/or

suffix (Syntax analyzing processing part are parts of speech that uses morpheme

information –suffix or parts of words- and first rule (dividing), page 7, lines 51-52

and page 5, lines 22-26).

when following the second rule, no first language character model segment (clause) is

found that matches the first structural segment (example stored inherently

includes structural segments such as phrase and clause division of the translated

language) (page 7 lines 10-14, no clause matching an example stored),

when no model segment to be selected following the second rule is found as a

result of the comparison of the structural segments, the structural segment is

displayed by means of a user interface and the equivalent segment of the display

structural

segment is stored in the knowledge base by means of the user interface (No example

found, following second rule, collating syntax, stored in translation example

memory, outputs into dividing part (deals with structural segment of sentence)

using apparatus that displays text, data is analyzed using knowledge and rules,

page 6, lines 26-27, lines 48-50 and page 2, line 34).

rules updated on the basis on output data from the user interface (Translation

rules from input data, page 2, lines 25 and 33).

As to claim 2, Franz teaches

information to be given as a character string in the second language is generated basis

of translation segments and a fourth rule (Fourth rule, probability of translated examples that match first or original language, page 5, lines 47-51).

As to claim 4, Franz teaches

structural segment comprises of a punctuation mark (See Fig 9C and page 26, line 12).

As to claim 5, Franz teaches

type identifier of the model segment is stored in logical connection with the model segment (Uses "converting part" as a type identifier, which will select which kind of model or 'example' that is matched with 1st language input page 3, lines 18-20).

As to claim 6, Franz teaches,

there are two model segments representing different languages logically connected to each other (Two model segments, examples and grammar used to find translation, both of those model segments use probability to match both languages, page 5 lines 51-53).

Claim 8 recites the same or similar limitations as claim 7, rejected above, and so claim 8 is rejected for the same reason above.

As to claim 9, Franz teaches,

characterized in that the method further comprises steps of:

reading the first information given as a character string in the first language (First

language character recognized, page 2, line 23);

translating the fist information given as a character string in said first language on the

basis of data in the knowledge base into first information given as a character

string in the second language to the extend allowed by the data available in the

knowledge base (First language sentence, character recognition, and second

language having 1st language sentence translated based on knowledge and rule

based on second language or translated language, page 2, lines 32-33);

determining the additional data needed to complete the translation of the first

information given as a character string in the first language into first information

in the form of the character string in the second language (Searches examples to

determine if there is match between the first language and the second language

sentence (character words), page 2, line 44);

feeding said additional data in the knowledge base to update the knowledge base

(Examples, which are in second language, are stored if not found in memory, the

'examples' are feed into knowledge base or memory, page 2, lines 48-50 and

59);

completing the translation of the first information given as a character string in the first

language into first information given as a character string in the second language

(Converting part supplies translation from search of unchanged words already

found in memory, which is the first information, to output as second language,

page 3, lines 3-4),

storing said first information given in the second language (Store unchanged parts to

translated word, page 2, lines 42-42 and 59);

reading the second information given as a character string in the first language

(Searches examples to determine if there is match between the first languages

and the second language sentence (character words), page 2, line 44; searching

the examples inherently includes reading),

translating the second information given as character string in the first language into

second information given as a character string in the second language on the

basis of said update data in the knowledge base (Second information, or

examples (or thesaurus) that matches first language, is stored in knowledge base

or memory, page 2, lines 5-6, 18-20).

As to claim 10, Franz teaches,

knowledge base means for storing model segments in the form of character strings in

said first language, and in logical connection with these, equivalent segments in

the form of character strings in the second language, and for storing a first,

second, and third rule (Store parameters of 'example' or model segment, and

matching it to stored second language, if not found, a probability of the word is

performed and the new 'example' is stored in memory, page 2 line 42 and page

5, lines 49-50).

The rest of the limitations of claim 10 are rejected for the similar reasons in

rejecting claim 1.

Claim 11 recites the same or similar limitations as claim 2, rejected above, and

therefore claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons.

As to claim 12, Franz teaches,

user interface means for connecting the user to said knowledge base means (text data

is outputted, and uses knowledge base, page 2, line 21 and page 2, lines 26-27).

As to claim 14, Franz teaches,

a first knowledge base and a second knowledge base so that specific users have

access to first knowledge base means and only some of specific uses have

access to second knowledge base means (first knowledge base is memory and

second knowledge base is the thesaurus, user is able to find out the words which

are in memory, but can access the thesaurus if necessary, page 7, lines 46-47

and page 8 lines 26-27).

As to claim 15, Franz teaches,

a first knowledge base means and a second knowledge base means, selective transfer

of data stored in said knowledge base to first knowledge base (first language, not

necessary to store examples of all possible first sentences, the system is

selective in what is stored, page 3, lines 41-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz

(EP 805403 A2), as applied to claim 10, in further view of Brown et al. (5,768,603).

As to claim 13, Franz teaches forming character strings in the second language,

and for storing a first, second, and third rule (page 7, lines 4-5, and 11, and page 9,

lines 16, 43, and 45; in a user interface means, Franz teaches that when there is a

match, then the translation is stored according to the following rules: first rule is division

pattern, second rule is phrase translation, and third rule is clause pattern, all rules are

stored).

Franz does not teach implementing a data transmission network.

However, Brown teaches a user interface means are connected to a knowledge

base means over a data transmission network (User interact with translation device and

receive document from translation system, then send the translation out on the external

network, uses source transducers (stores source sentence in memory) as knowledge

base, column 12, line 24-31 and column 13, lines 28-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Brown et al. in the user interface of

Franz, because, this would effectively enhance the user to receive a document from an

external network, and thus, translate it into another language using the translation and

then transmit the translation out on the external network, as taught by Brown, column 12

lines 21-31.

Conclusion

3.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. using MIME and HTML

standards.

4.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

272-8300.

7.   Information as to the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MP

06/10/2005

VIJAY CHAWAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER